

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NANCEE LARSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMONSPIRIT HEALTH,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00747-TLN-JDP (PS)

ORDER

TO SHOW CAUSE

RESPONSE DUE WITHIN FOURTEEN
DAYS

In April 2023, plaintiff commenced this action against Commonspirit Health and paid the required filing fee. To date, defendant has not appeared in this action, and plaintiff has not filed proof of service demonstrating that defendant was properly served. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(l).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). However, “if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.” *Id.* Although a pro se litigants are generally afforded more latitude than one represented by counsel, a party’s pro se status does not constitute “good cause” for failing to timely effect service. *See King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Pro se litigants must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants.”); *Townsel v. Contra Costa Cnty.*, 820 F.2d 319, 320 (9th Cir. 1987)

(holding that ignorance of service requirements does not constitute “good cause” for failure to timely effect service); *see also* E.D. Cal. L.R. 183(a) (“Any individual representing himself or herself without an attorney is bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure, these Rules, and all other applicable law.”). Accordingly, plaintiff will be ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to timely serve defendant.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff shall show cause within fourteen days from the date of this order why this action should not be dismissed for failure to effect service of process within the time prescribed by Rule 4(m).

2. Plaintiff is warned that failure to respond to this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to effect services of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 11, 2024


JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE